UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,660	02/06/2001	Mitsunari Uozumi	400979/Y.KAN	2526

23548 7590 08/12/2004

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960

EXAMINER	
STILES, WESLEY L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/776,660	UOZUMI, MITSUNARI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wesley Stiles	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 February 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 February 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 4, "Broadcast Page Generation Device" is labeled "Broadcast Padge Generation Device". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: reference number 1 is seemingly used in the specification to refer to more than one object of the drawing. On page 13 of the disclosure, the phrases "camera 1", "match 1", and "race 1" are used. The meaning of these phrases are ambiguous, as only "camera 1" refers to a reference number present in the figure, whereas "match 1" refers to an object in the figure and "race 1" refers to an object not present in the figure. Phrases that may be viewed as referring to a reference number in the figure that are not must be altered to remove confusion.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by another as stated in applicant's disclosure. In the section of the disclosure entitled "Description of the Related Art" as well as in Figure 4 (labeled as prior art), all limitations of the stated claim are presented and said to be known prior art. It is claimed to be known prior art the live broadcasting of a sports competition where teams compete in parallel (see page 1 lines 17-21), the video of which is captured by a plurality of image capturing devices (see Figure 4) creating a plurality of broadcast pages viewable on the internet, with the viewer selecting which feed to watch based on the content of those feeds (see page 1, line 25 to page 2, line 3). Also stated as prior art is the setting of advertisements to be shown on each and every page (see page 2, lines 20-23). All limitations of claim 1 are declared to be found in previous documentation by the applicant; therefore, claim 1 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the disclosed prior art in view of Kurtzman (US 6,144,944) and Marshall (US 2002/0010697). Regarding claim 2, the disclosure states that all limitations other than the method steps are known prior art (see rejection of

claim 1 above). The disclosed prior art fails to teach recognizing a team or player to be aired in each broadcast page created, and setting advertisements to be shown corresponding to that team or player.

4. In analogous art, Kurtzman teaches an advertisement system wherein the content of a page to be viewed is recognized and advertisements are set corresponding to that content (see column 1, lines 43-57). In the system of Kurtzman, an advertiser can sponsor a page or sponsor certain content, with their advertisement being displayed when either that page or any page with that content is viewed by the user (see column 2, lines 29-37). Kurtzman further teaches that recognizing and setting advertising according to content provides a much higher revenue percentage of potential customers (see column 1, lines 50-53).

5. Also in analogous art, Marshall discloses a web page devoted to individual teams and/or players, which is sponsored by local advertisers (see Figure 7 along with paragraph 26).

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to use the page sponsorship method as disclosed by Kurtzman and team specific web pages with local advertising in conjunction with the system as taught by Marshall to allow advertisers in a sporting event to sponsor a team or player-centered video feed, associating their product with that team in hopes of the viewer identifying the product with that athlete. Therefore, it would have been obvious to allow an advertiser to sponsor a broadcast page devoted to a player or team in hopes of the audience associating that player or team with the advertised product and for linking advertisers to a higher percentage of potential customers.

7. Regarding claim 3, the disclosed prior art states all aforementioned limitations of the claim. The components of the system are not taught in the prior art.

8. Kurtzman discloses an advertisement insertion processing means (see column 7, lines 21-25) which specifies a sponsor for the particular page content and inserts the advertisement of the sponsor specified into the broadcast page, and a sponsor database (met by ad server 100 of Figure 1) with page content and sponsor information (including sponsor identification information as disclosed in claim 8) with preferences for what type of content that sponsor would like to be associated with. In order for a database to hold sponsor preference information, an advertisement determination processing means is

implicitly necessary and present, wherein the sponsor initially sets preferences as to who or what they want their advertisements to be associated with. Since the system of Kurtzman teaches content-based advertising, it is inherent that the sponsor chooses what content they want to advertise within. When the user selects a page to view, content of that page (which can be stored in the ad server as stated in column 6, lines 25-34) is compared in an "affinity engine" such as the page sponsor engine 112 of figure 1 (see column 4, lines 41-44) and the appropriate sponsor for that content is displayed. In order for the system to insert the correct advertisements, it is implied that the sponsor be registered with sponsor information in the sponsor database. Advertisements are generated based on the sponsor information found in that database (see column 6, lines 59-65). Kurtzman further teaches recognizing and setting advertising according to content provides a much higher percentage of potential customers (see column 1, lines 50-53).

9. Marshall discloses a player information database (see Figure 7 along with paragraph 25) containing player information and team profiles and means for the display of that player and team information (see "web pages" of paragraph 25). This information is available to the advertiser as it is in a public domain, and could be used when making decisions about whether to advertise on a given page.

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the prior art camera and broadcast system with the player information database of Marshall and the sponsor determination/insertion system of Kurtzman. Kurtzman teaches a means by which sponsor information is stored in the sponsor database to correspond to predetermined content, and in conjunction with the other prior art, the combination teaches that the predetermined content be the broadcast page carrying the content of a designated team or player. In order to advertise for a single player as stated above, it is necessary that the sponsor have access to information regarding the person or team that they are planning to sponsor to make sure that the association by the audience fits their company image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the content-specific advertising with the player information database and the prior art broadcast system to allow an advertiser to sponsor a broadcast page devoted to a player or team in hopes of the audience

associating that player or team with the advertised product and for linking advertisers to a much higher percentage of potential customers.

11. Regarding claim 4, the combination of the disclosed prior art, Kurtzman, and Marshall disclose all of the limitations as stated in the claim, as discussed above.

12. Regarding claim 5, the combination of the disclosed prior art, Kurtzman, and Marshall disclose all of the limitations as stated in the claim, as discussed above.

13. Regarding claim 6, the combination of the disclosed prior art, Kurtzman, and Marshall disclose all of the limitations as stated in the claim, as discussed above.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a. White et al. (US 2002/0049979) discloses a multi-camera system broadcast over the internet where the user chooses which camera's video stream to view.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesley Stiles whose telephone number is (703) 308-6107. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-4:30, out of the office on alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on (703)305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WS
8/4/04

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER